UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

SCOTT SEDORE, #210661,

Plaintiff,

v.

Landfair, et al.,

Defendant.

LIGHTHOUSE LITIGATION, PLLC Joshua S. Goodrich, J.D., LL.M.(P83197) Attorneys for Plaintiff 5208 W. Saginaw Hwy, 81142 Lansing, MI 48917 (269) 312-7435 jsgoodrich@lighthouse-litigation.com

Case No. 2:22-CV-10060

Honorable Gershwin A. Drain United States District Judge

HACKNEY ODLUM & DARDAS Thomas G. Hackney (P81283) Connor A. McLaughlin (P83229) Attorneys for Victoria Hallet, DO 10850 E. Traverse Hwy, Ste 4440 Traverse City, MI 49684 (231) 642-5026 thackney@hodlawyers.com cmclaughlin@hodlawyers.com

MI DEPT. OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OG Reasons (P80463) Attorneys for the MDOC Defendants PO Box 30217 Lansing, MI 48909 (517) 335-3055 reasonso@michigan.gov

PLAINTIFF'S SCOTT SEDORE PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

Plaintiff Scott Sedore, by and through counsel, submits the following proposed verdict form:

JURY VERDICT FORM

We the jury unanimously answer the following questions submitted to us:

<u>Part A.</u> Claims against Defendant Sirenna Landfair, RN: Section 1983 Claim – Retaliation for Exercise of First Amendment Rights

As previously explained, the plaintiff has the burden of proving that the acts of the Defendant Landfair deprived the plaintiff of particular rights under the United States Constitution. In this case, the plaintiff alleges the defendant deprived him of his rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution when Defendants retaliated against him for exercising his First Amendment rights by placing him in medical segregation under false pretenses, which resulted in the deprivation of his scheduled law library visit during the COVID-19 restrictions.

Under the First Amendment, an inmate has the right to access the courts and petition the government for redress of grievances. This includes the right to file prison grievances, pursue civil rights litigation against prison officials to advocate for his right to proper treatment and medical service. To establish the defendant deprived the plaintiff of this First Amendment right, the plaintiff must prove the following additional elements by a preponderance of the evidence:

- 1. the plaintiff was engaged in conduct protected under the First Amendment;
- 2. the defendant took adverse action against the plaintiff;
- 3. the defendant took adverse action against the plaintiff because of the plaintiff's protected conduct;
- 4. the adverse action taken by the defendant chilled the plaintiff's exercise of his First Amendment rights; and
- 5. the action taken by the defendant did not reasonably advance a legitimate correctional goal.

For this type of claim, adverse action is action that would chill or silence a person of ordinary firmness from engaging in that activity.

To prevail, the plaintiff must show that his protected conduct was the substantial or motivating factor behind the defendant's conduct. A substantial or motivating factor is a significant factor. [The chronology of events may be con acti

sic	dered as cir		of a causal connection between the adverse uct.]	3
	by placing	him in medical segreg	for exercising his First Amendment rights gation under false pretenses, which resulted led law library visit during the COVID-19	1
	0	YES	NO	
	Defendant	-	e by a preponderance of the evidence that N take adverse against Plaintiff Sedore for ight?	
	0	YES	NO	
		o this question is "Yes' estion is "No", please g	', please answer the next question. If your	r
3	Did Defen	dant Landfair prove	by the preponderance of the evidence tha	t

Detendant Landfair prove, by the preponderance of the evidence, that she would have taken the same actions against the Plaintiff even if the Plaintiff had not engaged in protected conduct?

0	YES	NO

If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", please go directly to Part B.

		Defendant's Landfair's ac se his First Amendment rig	
(o YES	N	O
Please go	to Part B.		
Part B.	_	endant Alinda Florek, R xercise of First Amendmo	
Def		e prove by a preponderant, RN take adverse againment right?	
(o YES	N	О
-	_	tion is "Yes", please answ n is "No", please go direct	_
wou		ve, by the preponderance e actions against the Plair ed conduct?	
(o YES	N	О
		tion is "Yes", please answ n is "No", please go direct	
		Defendant's Landfair's ac se his First Amendment rig	
(oYES	N	О

Please go to Part C.

Part C. Claims against Defendant Victoria Hallet, DO: Section 1983 Claim – Retaliation for Exercise of First Amendment Rights

8.	Did Plaintiff Scott Sedore prove by a preponderance of the evidence the Defendant Victoria Hallet, DO take adverse against Plaintiff Sedore freezersing his First Amendment right?									
	o	YES	NO							
		to this question is "Yes", pthis question is "No", plea	please answer the next question. If se go directly to Part D.							
9.	would have tak		onderance of the evidence, that she st the Plaintiff even if the Plaintiff							
	o	YES	NO							
		to this question is "Yes", pthis question is "No", plea	please answer the next question. If se go directly to Part D.							
10		edore that Defendant's H by to exercise his First Amo	allets's actions chilled or deterred endment rights?							
	•	YES	NO							
	Please go to Par	rt D.								

Part D. Compensatory Damages

If you answered "Yes" to Question A(3), Question B(3), or Question C(3), then answer the following question. If not, then go to Part F.

1.	What is	the	e tot	al amoun	t of d	amages	th	at plaintiff	Sedor	e has pro	oved	with
	respect	to	his	Section	1983	Claim	_	Retaliation	n for	Exercise	of	First
	Amenda	mer	ıt Ri	ghts?								

\$_____

Please go to Part E.

Part E. Punitive

Damages

If your answer to Question A(3) was "Yes," please answer this question; if not, go to Part E Question 3.

- 1. **Re: Defendant Landfair**: Did plaintiff **Sedore** prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the conduct of defendant **Landfair** actions chilled or deterred Plaintiff's ability to exercise his First Amendment rights?
- 2. <u>Defendant Landfair</u> and was recklessly and callously indifferent to plaintiff's First Amendment rights?

o ____ YES ____ NO

If the answer to this question is "Yes", then please answer the next question. If your answer is "No," please go to Part E Question 3.

3. What amount of punitive damages do you award against defendant Landfair?

\$____

If your answer to Question B(3) was "Yes," please answer this question; if not, go to Part E Question 5.

	Re: Defendant Florek : Did plaintiff Sedore prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the conduct of defendant Florek actions chilled or deterred Plaintiff's ability to exercise his First Amendment rights?
	Defendant Florek was recklessly and callously indifferent to plaintiff's First Amendment rights?
	。 YES NO
	answer to this question is "Yes", then please answer the next question. If your er is "No," please go to Part E Question 3.
5.	What amount of punitive damages do you award against Defendant Florek?
	\$
If you to Par	r answer to Question C(3) was "Yes," please answer this question; if not, go t F.
	Re: Defendant Hallet : Did plaintiff Sedore prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the conduct of defendant Hallet actions chilled or deterred Plaintiff's ability to exercise his First Amendment rights?
2.	<u>Defendant Hallet</u> was recklessly and callously indifferent to plaintiff's First Amendment rights?
	o YES NO
	If the answer to this question is "Yes", then please answer the next question. If your answer is "No," please go to Part F. What amount of punitive damages do you award against defendant Hallet ?
	\$

Part F. Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Claim against Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC)

Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC)
Did Plaintiff Sedore prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he is an individual with a disability?
o YES NO
If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", please go directly to Part G. 2. Did Plaintiff prove that he was qualified to participate in or receive the benefits of the service, program, or activity in dispute?
YESNO If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", please go directly to Part G. 3. Did Plaintiff prove that he was excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of the service, program, or activity, or otherwise subjected to discrimination related to the service, program, or activity?
YES NO If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", please go directly to Part G. 4. Did Plaintiff prove that this exclusion or denial occurred by reason of his disability?
YES NO

If your answer to this question is "Yes", please go to the next question o
compensatory damages. If your answer to this question is "No", please g
directly to Part G.
Compensatory Damages
5. What is the total amount of damages that Plaintiff has proved wit

5. What is the total amoun respect to his Americans wi	t of damages that Plaintiff has proved with th Disabilities Act Claim?
\$	
Part G. Rehabilitation Act Cla (MDOC)	im Against Michigan Department of Corrections
1. Did Plaintiff prove by a mindividual with a disability?	preponderance of the evidence that he is an?
oYES	NO
	ion is "Yes", please answer the next question. stion is "No", you are done and can sign the
2. Did Plaintiff prove that he benefits of the service, progr	e was qualified to participate in or receive the ram, or activity in dispute?
$_{\circ}$ YES	NO

If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", you are done and can sign the verdict form.

3. Did	Plair	ntiff	prov	e t	hat	he	was	exclu	ıded	fro	m	partici	pat	tion	in,	or
denied	the	bene	efits	of t	the	ser	vice,	prog	ram,	or	ac	tivity,	or	othe	erwi	ise
subject	ed to	disc	rimi	nati	ion :	rela	ted t	o the	servi	ice,	pro	gram,	or	acti	vity	?



If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", you are done and can sign the verdict form.

4. Did Plaintiff prove that this exclusion or denial occurred solely because of his disability?

If your answer to this question is "Yes", please answer the next question. If your answer to this question is "No", you are done and can sign the verdict form.

5. Did Plaintiff prove that the MDOC receives federal funding?

o ____ YES ____ NO

If your answer to this question is "Yes", please go to the next question on compensatory damages. If your answer to this question is "No", you are done and can sign the verdict form.

Compensatory Damages

6. What is the total amount of damages that Plaintiff has proved with respect to his Rehabilitation Act Claim?

\$	
Τ	

Dated: March 13, 2025,

LIGHTHOUSE LITIGATION, PLLC

By:/S/Joshua S. Goodrich
Joshua S. Goodrich, J.D., LL.M.
(P83197)
Attorneys for Plaintiff
5208 W. Saginaw Hwy.
Lansing, MI 48917
(269) 312-7435
jsgoodrich@lighthouse-litigation.com

ERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 13, 2025, I filed this instant motion, electronically filed the above and foregoing PLAINTIFF'S SCOTT SEDORE PROPOSED VERDICT FORM with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record.

By:/s/Joshua S. Goodrich
Joshua S. Goodrich, J.D., LL.M. (P83197)